

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/088,170	03/15/2002	Katsushisa Kodama	2002-0364 A	8849	
513	7590 03/15/2004		EXAMINER		
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			SERGENT, RABON A		
2033 K STRI SUITE 800	EET N. W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			1711	·	
			DATE MAILED: 03/15/200	DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/088,170	KODAMA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner Art Unit		
•			0(
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	Rabon Sergent	1711 correspondence add	dress
Period for Reply	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reg. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed bys will be considered timely in the mailing date of this co ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02.	January 2004.		
· ·	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the	merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 20-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 20-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		· -	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached Offic	e Action or form PT	U-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No /ed in this National S	Stage
A44-abov-a-4/a)			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar	v (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail [	Date	450)
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO	-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/088,170

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The basis for the weight percent value remains unclear; it cannot be determined if the amine weight percent content is based upon the weight of decomposed polyol sans urea (and the associated residues) or upon the weight of the decomposed polyol containing the urea (and the associated residues)

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 54-78798.

The reference discloses the addition of urea to a polyurethane composition under conditions effective to decompose the polyurethane. See abstract. The disclosed process differs

from the instant process, in that the instant process requires addition of the urea to the decomposition products rather than the polyurethane; however, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to add the urea to the decomposition products, because one would have expected the urea to perform an equivalent function to the one it performs when added to the polyurethane, namely to aid in the further decomposition of the products.

- 4. The examiner has carefully considered applicants' response and claims, as amended; however, the position is maintained that the reference renders the claims *prima facie* obvious. Applicants have argued that the reference fails to teach the addition of the urea during the instantly claimed recovering process; however, applicants' claims lack any definitive process limitations, other than the addition of the urea, that define or further limit the recovering process. Accordingly, the recovering process merely requires that the urea be added at some point during the processing of the polyol. Therefore, it is not seen that the amended claims patentably distinguish the instant invention from the prior art to any extent greater than the previous claims distinguished the instant invention from the prior art.
- 5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1711

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINER

R. Sergent March 6, 2004